Mysterious Crop Circle



Mysterious Crop Circle



Some Hypotheses

- 1. Mysterious crop circles are caused by the actions of aliens from outer space.
- 2. Mysterious crop circles are caused by weird weather phenomena.
- 3. Mysterious crop circles are caused by hoaxers.
- 4. Some mysterious crop circles are caused in one way, others in other ways.
- 5. Mysterious crop circles do not have causes; nothing causes them.

The Principle of Universal Causation (PUC)

PUC: Every event has a cause.

'E1 is the <u>cause</u> of E2' is roughly equivalent to 'E1 is an event; E2 is an event; E1 occurs before E2; and E1 makes E2 occur'

The Free Will Thesis (FWT)

FWT: Sometimes people do things freely.

'S performed action A freely' is roughly equivalent to 'S performed action A, but S could have done otherwise; S could have avoided performing A'

'S is the source of S's action'

Finger-Wiggling Experiment



Where We Stand

After reflecting on the story about mysterious crop circles, everyone* is inclined to accept PUC.

After reflecting on the finger-wiggling experiment, everyone* is inclined to accept FWT.

*Except for a few hardcore wiseguys.

An Argument for Incompatibility of PUC and FWT

- 1. Every event has a cause. (PUC)
- 2. If every event has a cause, then determinism is true.
- 3. If determinism is true, then nobody ever acts freely.
- 4. Therefore, nobody ever acts freely. (denial of FWT)

Determinism: The facts about the past and the laws of nature entail every truth about the future.

• The BB & c1 & ... cn-1 & cn & Scott Drinks

• Compatibilism: Freewill and determinism are compatible. (Deny 3)

- Incompatibilism: Freewill and determinism are incompatible.
- Libertarianism: We have freewill. So determinism is false. (Deny 2 or 1).
 - Hard Determinism: Determinism is true. So we don't have freewill. (Accept Argument)
 - Hard Incompatibilism: There is no freewill if determinism is true. There is no freewill if determinism is false.

Radical Indeterminism

- D1: a is a <u>free action</u> just in case a is an action that has no cause.
 - There are some free actions.
 - People are morally responsible for their own free actions as well as the consequences of those actions.

Act Diagram for Indeterminism

- al: Leo's act of shooting
- c1: The gun fires
- c2: The Great Leader is shot
- c3: The Great Leader dies

-/->a1 c1 c2 c3

An Argument against Radical Indeterminism

- 1. If Radical Indeterminism is true, then Leo is morally responsible for assassinating the Great Leader.
- 2. Leo is not morally responsible for assassinating the Great Leader.
- 3. Therefore, Radical Indeterminism is not true.

Soft Determinism

D1: e is a <u>volition</u> = df. e is an act of willing, choosing, or intending to do some act.

D2: e is a <u>standard volition</u> = df. e is a volition, and e is caused by the beliefs and desires of the agent.

D3: a is a <u>voluntary action</u> = df. a is an action that is caused by a standard volition.

A Typical Form of Soft Determinism

- A. Every event has a cause. (PUC)
- B. There are some voluntary actions. (FWT')
- C. People are morally responsible for their own voluntary actions, as well as for the consequences of those actions.
- D. Whenever a person performs a voluntary action, and is responsible for that action, s/he was caused to perform that action, and could not have done anything else instead.

Act Diagram for Soft Determinism

bd: Bob wants \$\$ and believes he can get it by robbing the convenience store

v: Bob wills, chooses, or intends to rob the store

al: Bob robs the convenience store

c1: Mr. Convenience is very unhappy

 $? \quad bd \quad v \quad a1 \quad c1$

Act Diagram for Poor Paula's Act

ufo1: Aliens plant chip in Paula's brain

bd: Paula wants to kill Great Leader; thinks she can

v: Paula wills, chooses or intends to kill Great Leader

a1: Paula pulls the trigger

c1: The gun goes off

c2: The Great Leader is shot

c3: The Great Leader dies

 $ufo1 \in bd \in v \in c1 \in c2 \in c3$

An Argument against Soft Determinism

- 1. If Soft Determinism is true, then Poor Paula is morally responsible for assassinating the Great Leader.
- 2. It is not the case that Poor Paula is morally responsible for assassinating the Great Leader.
- 3. Therefore, it is not the case that Soft Determinism is true.

The Argument from Logical Fatalism

- 1. I clap my hands at noon today.
- 2. Necessarily, if I clap my hands at noon today, then it was true in 1000 AD that I would clap my hands at noon today.
- 3. If it was true in 1000 AD that I would clap my hands at noon today, then it was never within my power to prevent its being true in 1000 AD that I would clap my hands at noon today.
- 4. Therefore, it was never within my power to prevent its being true that I would clap my hands at noon today.
- 5. Its being true in 1000 AD that I would clap my hands at noon today entails that I clap my hands at noon today.
- 6. If (4) and (5), then it was never within my power to avoid clapping my hands today.
- 7. If it was never within my power to avoid clapping my hands at noon today, then I did not clap my hands freely.
- 8. Therefore, I did not clap my hands freely.

The Principle of the Fixity of the Past (FP): We have no power over the past.

The Transfer of Powerlessness Principle

(TP): If I'm powerless over one thing, and that thin entails a second thing, then I'm powerless over the second thing.

The Principle of Alternative Possibilities

(PAP): I'm morally responsible for performing an action only if I could have done otherwise.

The Principle of Alternative Possibilities

(PAP): An agent is morally responsible for performing a given act A only if he or she could have done otherwise.

The Argument Against PAP

- 1. If PAP is true, then Jones is not morally responsible for voting for Obama.
- 2. But Jones is morally responsible for voting for Obama.
- 3. So, PAP is false.